



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,629	12/17/2003	Avery Fong	246161US2CONT	4751
22850 7590 02/27/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER TSUI, WILSON W	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/27/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/27/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/736,629	Applicant(s) FONG ET AL.	
	Examiner Wilson Tsui	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/22/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on: 11/22/2006.
2. Claims 17-24 have been amended, and claims 25, 26, and 27 are new. Thus, claims 1-27 are pending.
3. The rejections (under 35 USC 101) for claims 17-24, have been withdrawn.
4. The Double Patenting rejections for claims 1-24, have been withdrawn.
5. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rada et al, and claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rada et al, in further view of Burnard.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117).

With regards to claim 1. Rada et al teaches a method of transforming information, comprising:

- *Inputting, into an editor, a first structural description of a first structured format:*
(page 100: whereas, the original data representation/first-structural-description is specified)
- *Inputting, into the editor, a second structural description of a second structured format; inputting, into the editor by a user, preferences for transforming an element of the first structural description to at least one element of the second structural description* (pages 100 and 101: whereas, the intermediate format/second-structural description is also specified, and preferences for transforming an element of the first structural description to at least one element of the second structural description are also entered using the recoding and structural mapping toolset);
- *Storing translation information output from the editor, the translation information comprising at least the preferences input by the user* (page 101: whereas, the translation information is stored in a recoded file);
- *transforming first information provided in the first structured format into second information in the second structured format based on the translation information* (page 101: whereas, using the recoded file, the first structured format/specific/original data representation is converted to the second/general/intermediate structure representation using the Specific to General tool.

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, wherein *the first structured format has a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy* (page 102: whereas, the first

Art Unit: 2178

structured format, can be SGML (which includes a DTD), such that the second format will by a structural format for a hypertext system).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, wherein *said first structured format is derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 3, *wherein the second structured format is a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy* (page 102: whereas, the second structured format, can be the open and interchange layer, and the first structured format can be the text markup language, such that the second structured format is SGML (which includes a DTD)).

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 3, further comprising: *outputting, from the editor to a graphical user interface, a representation of a translation between the first structured format and the second structured format* (page 114: whereas, a representation of a translation (translation from 'MUCH' to 'Guide') is shown/presented on a computer screen).

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 3, wherein *the second structured format is derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 13, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 15, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117), in further view of Burnard ("SGML on the Web: too little too soon, or too much too late?", published: November 1, pages 1-9).

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 3, RADA teaches *said first structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the first structured format is *eXtensible Markup Language (XML)*.

Burnard teaches a structured format is *eXtensible Markup Language (XML)*: whereas, "XML is used as a leaner and simpler subset of the SGML metalanguage" (p8-1)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's first structured format to have been the structured format of XML, as taught by Burnard. The combination of Rada and Burnard would have allowed Rada to have "been able to support a wide variety of applications, and with a

Art Unit: 2178

concise formal design" (Rada, p8-1).

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 7, RADA teaches *said second structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the second structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*.

Burnard teaches a structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*: whereas, "XML is used as a leaner and simpler subset of the SGML metalanguage" (p8-1)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's second structured format to have been the structured format of XML, as taught by Burnard. The combination of Rada and Burnard would have allowed Rada to have "been able to support a wide variety of applications, and with a concise formal design" (Rada, p8-1).

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 4, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 15, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 4, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 24, which depends on claim 23, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

8. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117), and Burnard ("SGML on the Web: too little too soon, or too much too late?", published: November 1, pages 1-9), in further view of Linden ("Structured Document Transformations", published: June 1997, pages: NP-1, NP-48, NP-49, NP-50, NP-53).

With regards to claim 25, which depends on claim 1, Rada teaches *wherein the preferences for transforming*, as similarly explained by the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the preferences for transforming *include a user selection of which elements of the first structured format to map to the second structured format*.

Linden teaches the preferences for transforming *include a user selection of which elements of the first structured format to map to the second structured format* (NP-49, NP-50, and NP-53: whereas, a user selects elements of a first/source format to map to a second/target format through the use of a graphical tool, such as the mapper tool of Figure 4.7).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's user preferences, such that they further included preferences for transforming through a user selection, as taught by Linden. The combination of Rada and Linden would have allowed Rada to have allowed the user to have made "symbol associations by selecting source and target symbols" (Linden, NP-50).

Art Unit: 2178

With regards to claim 26, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method performed in claim 25, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 27, which depends on claim 17, for a computer readable medium encoded with instructions which perform a method similar to the method performed in claim 27, is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. With regards to claim 1, the applicant first argues that "Rada does not disclose or suggest any user input in conjunction with the recoding and structural mapping toolset", and that Rada instead "discloses that programs are generated to recode the markups and to do the translation". However, the interactive interface (page 100) that supports different stages of generating a translator, further includes a "Recoding Toolset" as one of the plurality of stages, and a "Structural Mapping Toolset" as one of the plurality of stages (page 101: whereas, there are three stages, and one of the stages includes the Recoding and Structural Toolset). Since the "Recoding toolset", and the "Structural Mapping Toolset" are included as one of the plurality of stages, and "the ICA system provides three tool types and an interactive interface to support different stages of generating a translator"(page 100), then each of the Toolsets are interactive as well. Thus, as explained in pages 100, and 101 of Rada, and also in the rejection for claim 1, the Recoding toolset and/or the Structural Mapping Toolset are used to recode markups by replacing a data representation of a first format, to a data representation of a second

Art Unit: 2178

format, and the toolsets are interactive (collect input/preferences from a user), then user input/preferences is/are used in conjunction with the recoding and structural mapping toolset, and the applicant's first argument is not persuasive.

Secondly, the applicant argues that Rada's toolsets do not teach or suggest user input in conjunction with the recoding and structural mapping toolset since, Rada "discloses that programs are generated to recode the markups and to do the translation" (page 101). However, the examiner respectfully points out that the programs that are generated to recode the markups and to do the translation, are made possible by using the Recoding Toolset and/or Specific-To-general tool (including in the Structural Mapping Toolset). As explained above, the examiner as shown/explained that the toolsets are user interactive, and thus, since each of the programs are used to recode the markups and do the translations by incorporating the interactive Toolsets, then they include the element of user preferences as well. Thus, the applicant's second argument is not persuasive.

Third, the applicant argues that "Rada does not disclose or suggest that there is user input information included in the recoded file". As pointed out by the applicant, the recoding toolset changes markup codes by replacing codes in an original data representation with their intermediate counterparts, and generates a program to recode the markups. The program generated to recode the markups uses the interactive recoding toolset as a resource, as explained previously by the examiner. Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2178

11. The applicant also argues that since claim 1 is allowable, claims 2-16, and 25 (which depend directly or indirectly upon independent claim 1), are allowable, is not persuasive, since claim 1, has been shown/explained to be rejected.

12. With respect to the applicant's argument that claims 9 and 17 (which recite elements analogous to those of claim 1, are allowable, is not persuasive since claim 1 has been shown/explained to be rejected.

13. With respect to the applicant's argument that claims 10-16, and 18-27 are allowable, since they depend directly or indirectly upon independent claim 1, is not persuasive, since claim 1 has been shown to be rejected.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W. T. 2/15/07

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
February 15, 2007


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER